

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 26 2006

REMARKS

The present claim amendments are responsive to the Examiner's concerns noted in the Office Action.

Summary of the Response

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claims 15-18 have been added. Claims 1-18 remain pending in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the present application as amended are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 4-10 and 12. These claims have not been rewritten given the traversal of the rejection of the independent claim 1 below.

Claim Objections Under 35 USC 112

Claim 1 has been amended to include part of the limitations of original claim 2, which provides the necessary antecedent basis for the dependent claims noted by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maeda et al. (6,883,924). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Given the traversal of the rejection below, Applicant has not yet considered the possibility of “swearing behind” the 102(e) reference. Applicant reserves the right to do so at a later time should the need arise in the future.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “said sectional shape is substantially triangle shape having one tip angle and two tilt angles, and wherein the tilt angles are different from each other in each prism”.

Maeda does not disclose a corresponding structure in which the two tilt angles are different within each prism. As such, Maeda does not anticipate claim 1 as amended.

Accordingly, all the dependent claims are also not anticipated by Maeda, for at least the reasons stated above. The dependent claims add further limitations, which render them patentable over Maeda for additional reasons. For example, new dependent claim 16 further recites that the tip angle is constant for each prism. Maeda does not teach this combination of constant tip angle for each prism and different tilt angles within each prism. Amended dependent claim 2 further recites that at least one of the sectional shapes is substantially non-isosceles triangle, given the different tilt angles. New dependent claim 18 recites that all the sectional shapes are of substantially non-isosceles triangle. Maeda does not disclose non-isosceles shaped prisms in its structure.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 26 2006

**CONCLUSION**

In view of all the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims pending in this application are patentable over the references of record and are in condition for allowance. Such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. **The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative to discuss any outstanding issues that may not have been adequately addressed in this response.**

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2006

/Wen Liu/Wen Liu  
Registration No. 32,822LIU & LIU  
444 S. Flower Street; Suite 1750  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 830-5743  
Facsimile: (213) 830-5741  
Email: wliu@liulaw.com